



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/620,117	07/15/2003	Robert A. Matousek	12618	8636

26637 7590 03/11/2005

CNH AMERICA LLC
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW DEPARTMENT
700 STATE STREET
RACINE, WI 53404

EXAMINER

ADAMS, GREGORY W

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3652

DATE MAILED: 03/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/620,117

Applicant(s)

MATOUSEK, ROBERT A. ET AL.

Examiner

Gregory W. Adams

Art Unit

3652

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. Referring to Specification page 1, line 24, the listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 5 & 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. With respect to claim 5, line 5, it is unclear whether the axis is common the intermediate and upper section, or in the alternative is common to the upper, intermediate and lower sections.

5. With respect to claim 8, it is unclear whether applicant is claiming an unloading assembly, or whether applicant is claiming a combine in combination with an unloading system.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Niewold (US 4,411,581).

8. With respect to claim 1, referring to FIGS. 1-7 Niewold discloses a system 16 for unloading grain comprising an unloading conduit assembly 16, vertical conduit 68, 72 which rotates about a vertical axis (col. 5, Ins. 55-65) and pivots sideways 72 and a horizontal conduit.

9. With respect to claim 2, referring to FIGS. 1-7 Niewold discloses a system 16 for unloading grain comprising a vertical conduit 68, 72 which rotates about a vertical axis (col. 5, Ins. 55-65) and pivots sideways 72, and a horizontal conduit.

10. With respect to claim 3, referring to FIGS. 1-7 Niewold discloses a vertical conduit 68, 72 which pivots sideways 70, 76, 78.

11. With respect to claim 4, referring to FIGS. 1-7 Niewold discloses a system 16 for unloading harvested grain 16 including a vertical conduit 68, 72 extending upward from a storage tank 12 and a horizontal conduit extending radially from vertical conduit wherein a vertical conduit 68, 72 pivots sideways about a horizontal pivot axis 70, 76, 78.

12. With respect to claim 5, referring to FIGS. 1-7 Niewold discloses a vertical conduit 68, 72 which includes a lower section 48, intermediate section 68, upper section 68 wherein intermediate and upper sections rotate relative to a lower section 48.

13. With respect to claim 6, referring to FIGS. 1-7 Niewold discloses an upper section 68 which pivots about a horizontal pivot axis 72.

14. With respect to claim 7, referring to FIGS. 1-7 Niewold discloses a vertical conduit 68, 72 pivots about a horizontal pivot axis 76, 78.

15. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fredriksen et al. (US 5,029,436). Referring to FIGS. 1-9 Fredriksen et al. '436 discloses an agricultural combine 1 including a threshing assembly system 33 for unloading grain comprising a loop conveyor, unloading conduit 20, 22, 27, 33 and horizontal conduit 34.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fredriksen et al. (US 5,029,436) in view of Niewold (US 4,411,581). Referring to FIGS. 1-9 Fredriksen et al. '436 disclose a vertical conduit 33 extending out from a storage tank 29, horizontal conduit 34 extending radially from a vertical conduit 33. Fredriksen et al. do not disclose a vertical conduit which pivots sideways. Referring to FIGS. 1-7 Niewold discloses a vertical conduit 68, 72 which pivots sideways about a horizontal

Art Unit: 3652

pivot axis 70, 76, 78. Niewold replaces a rigid vertical conduit with one that pivots about a horizontal axis to replace a rigid unloading system with a mobile relative to a storage tank swiveling mounted unloader with two degrees of movement. Col. 1, Ins. 10-35.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the vertical conduit of Fredriksen et al. to allow for sideways pivoting about a horizontal axis, as per the teachings of Niewold '581, to replace a rigid unloading system with a mobile relative to a storage tank swiveling mounted unloader with two degrees of movement.

18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 5,551,776 to Zimmerman

US 2,730,256 to Loudon et al.

US 4,907,402 to Pakosh

US 3,339,758 to Hubert

US 4,408,947 to Lenski et al.

US 3,825,138 to Pool


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory W. Adams whose telephone number is (703) 305-0555. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eileen D. Lillis can be reached on (703) 308-3248. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3652

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

GWA



EILEEN D. LILLIS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600